

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 553

TM 830 817

AUTHOR Intriligator, Barbara A.
TITLE Evaluating Inter-Organizational Relationships.
PUB DATE 11 Apr 83
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, Montreal, Quebec, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Cooperative Planning; Evaluation Methods; Institutional Characteristics; *Institutional Cooperation; *Models; Regional Cooperation; Research Coordinating Units
IDENTIFIERS *Interorganizational Relationships

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a paradigm for evaluating an inter-organizational relationship (IOR) wherein two or more independent organizations agree to pool their authority, resources, and energies in order to achieve the goals they desire. Indicators of IOR effectiveness are clustered into four major categories: organizational situations, structural characteristics, relational characteristics, and process characteristics. Organizational characteristics conducive to a collaborative IOR include the existence of potential resources, a generally cooperative environment, and congruence between the organization's goals and IOR goals. Structural characteristics of IORs include coordinating mechanisms, demographic conditions, and resource contributions. Relational characteristics of IORs include interactions among individual representatives of member organizations, and complex and multiple ties at various levels. Process characteristics of IORs include degree of formality, features of the exchange process, and patterns of influence. Evaluations of IORs need to attend to these four components in the paradigm. (BW)

*****~*****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED237553

EVALUATING INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

by

Barbara A. Intriligator
University of Maryland - College Park

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

* This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

A Paper Presented At The Annual Meeting of
The American Educational Research Association

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. A. Intriligator

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Montreal, Canada

April 11, 1983

TM 830 817

EVALUATING INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

The Context

The federal role in education has changed dramatically over the past three years, and will continue to do so, as the administration of educational functions and programs is delegated to the states and locals. It has been predicted that this change will significantly effect school improvement activities, because it was the federal education system that had the opportunity, interest, ability and resources to engage in improvement efforts.¹

There has been some concern, however, about the readiness and willingness of state governments to assume these additional responsibilities for school improvement. Brickell posits a cogent explanation when he suggests that "... the primary role of government agencies is to assure the minimum behavior of individuals and organizations needed to keep the society running...(therefore, they)virtually never appropriate money for administrative agencies to conduct general-purpose, broad-band, unfocused efforts to improve general behaviors of individuals or organizations beyond some acceptable minimum."²

Although local school districts differ widely in their interest and ability to develop a substantive school improvement agenda, they too are governed by boards that tend to enable or regulate minimum behavior. In addition, they are facing serious problems that interfere with their maintaining a level of organizational health conducive to growth and change. Declining enrollments, financial crises, serious staff morale problems and public dissatisfaction with educational outcomes have forced the local schools to deal with issues of organizational survival, rather than growth or renewal.

Within the educational system there are a number of organizations that

either have engaged in, or that have the potential to contribute to school improvement efforts. They include regional education agencies (REAs) and schools, colleges and departments of education (SCDEs).³ In addition, the business and industry sectors have demonstrated an interest in school improvement.⁴ In essence, the responsibility for the improvement of conditions of professional practice in the public schools has now shifted almost completely to these agencies and to the local schools themselves. Importantly, neither the local schools nor these salient agencies in their environment appear to have the resources and/or the capacity to engage in school improvement efforts independently.

Therefore, a major challenge now confronts the current organizational actors in school improvement efforts. REAs, SCDEs and industry/business organizations need to find ways to connect with the local schools during each phase of an improvement effort. Similarly, local school systems need to develop viable procedures that will enable them to interact with and optimally use the resources of these other agencies in order to conduct improvement activities. These needs have fostered a growing interest in the research community in designing mutually satisfying inter-organizational arrangements that would facilitate successful school improvement efforts.⁵ In practice, developing formal inter-organizational relationships among collaborating organizations has become a feasible and viable strategy for accomplishing educational improvement efforts.⁶ In addition, having the ability to design and evaluate such inter-organizational structures and processes will enable us to move beyond attending to procedures and to concentrate on determining the effectiveness of the actual improvements that we wish to institutionalize.

The Problem

This paper presents a paradigm for evaluating an increasingly important organizational arrangement wherein two or more independent organizations agree to pool their authority, resources and energies in order to achieve a goal or goals they desire. These arrangements, called inter-organizational relationships (IORs) in this paper, also appear under the names of collaboratives, cooperatives, coalitions and consortia. Studies of IORs have been conducted in the fields of health, social welfare, rural community development, municipal governments, business and rehabilitation, as well as in education.⁷

Current IOR research has, for the most part, treated relationships among organizations as properties of organizations. Although that approach adds a dimension to organizational analysis, it fails to help us understand the inter-organizational field. My research focuses on inter-organizational behavior as a relational attribute, as well as an organizational property. Data has been analyzed as representative of the relationship among organizations, rather than as simply representative of individual member organizations. This work derives from observation and in-depth interviews conducted with participants in two types of voluntary inter-organizational relationships: Massachusetts IORs formed by school districts to deliver specialized programs and services, and a University-school system IOR formed to deliver administrative training to public school practitioners in Maryland.⁸

The conceptual problem is to think about the great variety of possible relations and transactions that may occur among different organizations. It is my thesis that successful inter-organizational relationships have a collaborative focus --that is, because member organizations define themselves as interdependent,

they agree to participate in a shared decision-making process in order to accomplish the functions and goals of the IOR. Member organizations structure the relationship by creating a new organizational entity, with its own director, staff and budget. This new organization becomes the vehicle through which member organizations accomplish IOR goals, with all parties assuming mutual and equitable responsibility for IOR planning and operations. The major question becomes: how can we structure and manage the interaction among IOR member organizations, and between the IOR and its member organizations, in order to insure collaboration.

The Evaluation Paradigm

This paradigm for evaluation directs attention to the prior organizational situations of members of the IOR, and then delineates structural, relational and process characteristics of successful IORs. Finally, the attention of the audience is directed to local level characteristics. An analytic framework is presented for designing evaluations of effective IORs.

To reiterate, the goal of inter-organizational arrangements is to create a defined interdependency among member organizations and a perceived commonality of purpose, goals, interests or clients that allows them to collaborate in joint programs. True collaboration, or shared decision-making, is the most difficult and most powerfully predictive element in the design and operations of effective inter-organizational relationships.

Prior Situations of IOR members

There are a number of organizational characteristics and properties that are conducive to an individual organization's ability to design and conduct an inter-organizational relationship that has a collaborative focus. The first

of these is the existence of potential resources that may be gathered in the interests of IOR programs and functions. In some cases, the expanded goals of an IOR may permit capturing of external resources that are unavailable to any individual member of the collaborative. In addition, even though organizations may not be able to make major financial contributions to the IOR effort, people, programs, allocation of time as well as high level administrative endorsement all may constitute significant internal resource contributions by member organizations to a successful IOR.

A second characteristic that is significant in determining the success of IOR efforts is the general cooperative environments of individual member organizations. Incentives and/or supports, other than resources, for engaging in voluntary collaborative relationships may be available from governmental agencies, regional planning groups or from public policy programs. Organization internal reward systems may provide personal or group incentives that would encourage personnel to participate in IOR activities. Furthermore, some potential members have a history of accomplishing some goals through outreach activities and inter-organizational arrangements. This predisposition to interact with other organizations will contribute to the potential success of a new joint effort.

The amount of congruence between individual organization goals and the IOR superordinate goal is the third factor in the prior situation that facilitates successful collaborative interactions. Indeed, a necessary condition for IOR effectiveness is agreement by all member organizations on a superordinate goal -- that is, a common purpose that each of the parties can agree to accomplish jointly through the inter-organizational arrangement. As a general guideline, the primary purpose for each member in joining the IOR should be directly related to

its own internal operations and mission in order to secure commitment. By extension, the IOR's superordinate goals and functions are defined as being of immediate and recognizable utility to member organizations' individual missions.

All of these properties of individual organizations prior to participating in an inter-organizational relationship have the potential to positively influence the collaborative focus of the IOR and thereby cause it to be successful.

Structural Characteristics of IORs

Structural characteristics of IORs include types of coordinating mechanisms; demographic conditions, including homogeneity, geographic location and size; and resource contributions.

Selection of an appropriate coordinating mechanism is influenced by a number of cultural and organizational factors. Members may chose to formalize the joint effort by the development of a contract that clarifies each member's role responsibilities and organizational domain.⁹ Members may plan activities cooperatively, with an agreement that the joint activity belongs primarily to one member.¹⁰ Another option is for members to create a new organizational entity, within which they plan and conduct all activities and functions collaboratively.¹¹ The latter coordinating mechanism is most conducive to establishing an effective collaborative IOR. As the relationship matures, however, IOR functions increase and IOR interactions become more complex. Under those conditions, a number of different coordinating mechanisms may be added so that the IOR can remain effective.

Structural properties of effective IORs are also influenced by demographic conditions.¹² They are composed of members with similar organizational structures. If the composition of membership in these structurally similar organizations is

homogeneous, there will be more opportunities for sharing information in the IOR about each member's goals, services and resources --a necessary condition for collaborative interaction. In addition, several studies have confirmed the importance of IOR members being located in contiguous geographic regions.¹³

Ease of access of organizational members to each other facilitates the expansion of IOR functions and increases the opportunity for multiple linkages being formed among the participants. These are also necessary conditions for effective collaboration. Finally, the size of an IOR influences its success. In general, size should be compatible with member organizations' abilities to make cooperative decisions when required. It would also appear that the appropriate size of an IOR is most dependent upon both the amount of resources available to support IOR functions, and by extension, whether or not resource contributions are a requirement for IOR membership.

The conditions under which resource contributions are made to the IOR, as well as the degree of flexibility that is used to assess such contributions is the final property of IOR structures that influences effectiveness. Direct financial contributions to an inter-organizational arrangement --even in very small sums-- demonstrates commitment to the IOR initiative. In addition, member organizations must be willing to reinterpret the importance of available resources both in terms of fiscal flexibility and recognition of legitimate, evolving contributions in kind.

In order to get a complete assessment of IOR effectiveness, data that describes the relationships among IOR members and the relationship between the IOR and its member organizations must also be collected. In general, the interaction processes in successful IORs are delineated in such a way that each member organi-

zation has an equitable opportunity to participate in the collaborative decision-making process.

Relational Characteristics of IORs

Relational characteristics of IORs include both the nature of the involvement of individual representatives of member organizations and the extent to which multiple and complex ties are formed between and among the organizational participants. Member organizations appoint individual representatives to the IOR, who typically constitute an advisory or policy board for the collaborative.

In practice, the interactions that occur among individual representatives of member organizations are very complex. IORs are designed by people who carry with them to the interaction a set of personal agenda. Moreover, the same individuals will function at some times in a personal role and at other times in an organization representational role. In fact, these individuals typically use their participation in the IOR as a means to accomplish personal goals in their home organizations. At the same time, when these individuals serve in an organizational role, they function in the IOR interaction as supporters of the IOR, as advocates for their own organizations' needs, and as protectors of their own organizations' domains. Thus, they bring to the inter-organizational relationship two sets of expectations: the first relates to their own independent organizational goals; and the second relates to their interest in sustaining the inter-organizational arrangement. Importantly, there are instances when these two sets of competing role expectations are not congruent and do not allow them to make decisions that are in the best interests of the joint effort.¹⁴ Such dissonance in the individual organization representatives interferes with successful collaboration, and therefore with IOR effectiveness.

Another indicator of dysfunction in the IOR would be an over-reliance on personal relationships between and among policy board members to sustain inter-organizational ties. This information can be ascertained by the frequency with which individual representatives view their participation in the IOR as a part of their personal roles rather than their organization representational role. In addition, collaboration will become disrupted when the role incumbents (current representatives) from some or all of the participating organizations change. Successful collaborative efforts circumvent these unanticipated consequences of dependence on particular individuals to insure member commitment to the IOR, first by using a formal IOR organizational structure as the coordinating mechanism.

Second, the development of complex and multiple ties at various levels of the participating organizations obviates this over-reliance on specific individuals to foster a collaborate level of interaction in the IOR. Indeed, several IOR studies have indicated that inter-organizational arrangements contain both single level linkages and multiple level linkages among individuals in different positions in each organizational unit.¹⁵ The greater the number of multiple linkages among IOR member organizations, the more that participants view the IOR effort as successful --mostly because more benefits accrue to the individual organizations that they attribute directly to their involvement in the IOR. It should be noted that loosely coupled connections among IOR member organizations are most conducive to the development of these multiple and complex ties.¹⁶ Thus, effective IORs tend to initiate loosely coupled relationships among member IORs, rather than relying exclusively upon structural ties. In sum, developing a variety of both formal and informal ties with each member organization in the IOR facilitates the development of a collaborative or shared decision-making process in the inter-organizational arrangement.

Process Characteristics of IORs

The final component of the evaluation paradigm focuses on the characteristics of interaction processes in effective IORs. Process characteristics include degree of formality, features of the exchange process and patterns of influence.

Formality is defined as the extent to which each member organization has officially sanctioned its participation in the IOR. IOR interaction processes are influenced by the degree of formality present in the inter-organizational arrangement in two ways. First, representatives of organizations that have formally sanctioned IOR membership tend to have stronger bargaining positions when negotiating an inter-organizational agreement. That is, they speak with the strength of their own organizations' support. Second, the formality of IOR membership aids individual representatives when they serve as advocates of IOR activities in their home organizations. That is, they speak with the strength of IOR consensus. Similarly, inter-organizational relationships are considered to have a high degree of formality when participating organizations officially sanction their involvement in an inter-¹⁷organizational arrangement. My research has indicated that successful IORs are composed of organizations that have each formalized their participation in the IOR.

A second process characteristic of IORs is the exchange process. IOR members exchange goods and services with other participating organizations in the collaborative arrangement. There are several aspects of the exchange process that influ-¹⁸ence the degree of collaborative interaction that can be attained in an IOR. First, features of the exchange process need to be standardized. That is, both the units of exchange and the procedure for making the exchange need to be clearly delineated. In addition, attaining a reasonable degree of standardization in IOR

interactions is a pre-requisite to the establishment of a formal coordinating mechanism for the collaborative.

The number of joint interactions and the amount of resources (including people, programs, services and funds) that are allocated directly to the IOR by each participating organization are both indicators of the intensity of the exchange process in an inter-organizational arrangement. Furthermore, the intensity of the exchange process that guides inter-organizational transactions is influenced both by the extent to which the terms of the exchange are mutually reached and by whether the exchanges are viewed as reciprocal. Thus, a collaborative inter-organizational relationship is also defined by a voluntary and reciprocal transfer of resources between and among member organizations. Further, all member organizations must believe that they can make input that will be valued and used. In sum, collaborative arrangements depend upon standardized, intense and reciprocal exchange behaviors. In effective IORs, member organizations use the exchange process as the basis upon which they transact the inter-organizational relationship.¹⁹

The third process characteristic of collaborative interactions is the patterns of influence present in the relationship. Effective collaborative arrangements will develop only when inter-organizational transactions are not dependent upon the use of power and status differentials among member organizations. Therefore, each member organization's domain must be acknowledged and consensus must be reached on organizational prerogatives in defining and accomplishing IOR goals and functions. Domain consensus, or agreement about the appropriate role and scope of each member organization in the inter-organizational arrangement, is a necessary prerequisite for building collaborative interaction processes.²⁰ Importantly, agreement must be obtained about both the domains that are to be shared and the domains that are

to be reserved to each member organization. Therefore, the achievement of domain consensus in the inter-organizational relationship may be dependent upon clear understandings about the degree of compatibility of member organizations' goals, reference orientations and philosophies.

Lines of authority must be carefully delineated as another important pattern of influence in an inter-organizational relationship. Benson has suggested that the primary reason to create an IOR is the pursuit of increased authority and additional money, each of which is viewed as a resource by member organizations.²¹ Similarly, Huberman et. al. suggest that "It is important to identify various sources of power in the interorganizational arrangement...Power can derive from an organization's structural position in the interorganizational arrangement, as well as from resource dependencies, expertness and/or legitimacy."²² Finally, organizational participants in an IOR seek to form exchange relationships that cost the least in terms of autonomy and power.²³ In sum, successful IORs have deliberately identified superordinate goals and interaction processes for the IOR that can obviate individual organizational concerns about the loss of autonomy and power.

Conclusion

This paper has presented an analytic framework that may be used to evaluate effective inter-organizational relations. Indicators of effectiveness are clustered into four major categories, each of which represents a major component of the evaluation paradigm. Table 1 contains a brief outline of these components. (p. 13)

Insert Table 1

Table 1

Evaluation Paradigm for Inter-organizational Relationships

ORGANIZATIONAL SITUATIONS PRIOR TO IOR MEMBERSHIP

- existence of potential resources
- general cooperative environment
- congruence between member and IOR goals

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF IORS

- coordinating mechanisms
- demographic conditions (homogeneity, location, size)
- resource contributions

RELATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF IORS

- involvement of individual representatives
- complex and multiple organizational ties

PROCESS CHARACTERISTICS OF IORS

- degree of formality
- the exchange process (standardization, intensity, reciprocity)
- patterns of influence (domain consensus, authority, power)

Evaluations of IORs need to attend to the four components in the paradigm. Each of the components will provide the evaluator with discrete sets of data about (1) organizational properties prior to IOR membership; (2) structural characteristics of IORs; (3) relational attributes of IORs; and (4) characteristics of the IOR interaction processes. In addition, analysis of the interactions within and between these data sets will provide a comprehensive view of the complexity of inter-organizational collaboration. Also, evaluation designs that utilize this analytical framework will provide a total look at the potential for IOR effectiveness.

Footnotes

1

See for example: D. L. Clark & M. A. Amiot. The impact of the Reagan administration on federal policy. Phi Delta Kappan, December 1981, 63(4), 258-262.

2

H. M. Brickell, The role of state education agencies in dissemination. In S. McKibbin & M. Malkas (Eds.), Dissemination and School Improvement in Educational Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, February 1982, pp. 116-118 passim.

3

See: (1) D. L. Clark & E. Guba. A study of teacher education institutions as innovator, knowledge producer and change agencies. (NIE No. 4-0752) Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, April 1977; (2) C. Moran & L. Hutchins. Intermediate service agencies and school improvement: An analysis of recent research. In S. McKibbin & M. Malkas (Eds.), Dissemination and School Improvement in Educational Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, February 1982; and (3) J. S. Lotto & D. L. Clark. An assessment of current and potential capacity of schools of education with recommendations for federal support strategies. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, June 1978.

4

See: (1) C. S. Cates. Industry-education collaboration for school improvement. (NIE No. 400-80-0103) San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, December 1981; (2) H. M. Jellison (Ed.). Interface through cooperative arrangements: Eleven examples of how it can work. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, July 1981; and (3) E. E. Peart. An assessment of characteristics of cooperative agreement between postsecondary educational institutions and business, industry and labor. (Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education No. G007603722) Greeley, CO: University of Northern Colorado, September 1977.

5

See for example: (1) A. M. Huberman. School-university collaboration supporting school improvement: Vol I, the midwestern state teacher center network case. (NIE No. 400-79-0063) Washington, D.C.: Knowledge Transfer Institute, the American University, June 1981; (2) B. A. Intriligator. Planning an inter-organizational relationship: The Maryland field-based doctoral program. College Park, MD: University of Maryland, 1982; (3) TDR Associates, Inc. Case studies of three urban university-school collaboratives mandated for the improvement of educational practice, Vol I. (NIE No 400-79-0064) Newton, MA: TDR Associates, Inc., October 1981; and (4) R. K. Yin & M. K. Gwaltney. Organizations collaborating to improve educational practice. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc., April 1981.

6

See for example: (1) C. S. Cates, P. D. Hood & S. McKibbin. An exploration of interorganizational arrangements that support school improvement. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, November

12

See for example: D. E. Gillespie & D. S. Mileti. Technostructures and inter-organizational relations. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company, 1979.

13

See for example: (1) C. S. Cates, P. D. Hood & S. McKibbin. An exploration of interorganizational arrangements that support school improvement. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, November 1981; and (2) D. S. Mileti & D. F. Gillespi. An integrated formalization of organization-environmental interdependencies. Human Relations, January 1976, 29, 85-100.

14

See: (1) T. Haas. Linking agents and school improvement. In R. Millikin (Ed.) The educational consultant. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1982; and (2) B. A. Intriligator, The educational collaborative: An exploratory study of the relationships between selected interorganizational behaviors and cooperative interaction among member school systems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Boston University, 1978.

15

See for example: S. E. Mindlin & H. Aldrich. Interorganizational dependence: A review of the concept and a re-examination of the findings of the Aston group. Administrative Science Quarterly, September 1975, 20, 382-392; (2) P. Dalin. Networks for educational change. Oslo, Norway: IMTEC, February 1977. Unpublished.; and (3) TDR Associates, Inc. Case studies of three urban university-school collaboratives mandated for the improvement of educational practice, Vol I. (NIE No 400-79-0064) Newton, MA: TDR Associates, Inc. October 1981.

16

See: (1) C. Kadushin. On the problem of formalizing emergent networks among innovators in education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1979; (2) R. N. Stern. The development of an interorganizational central network: The case of inter-collegiate athletics. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1979, 23, 142-149; and (3) K. E. Weick. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1975, 21, 1-19.

17

See for example: (1) H. P. Dachler & B. Wilpert. Conceptual dimensions and boundaries of participation in organizations: A critical evaluation. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1978, 23, 1-39; (2) A. R. Neghandi (Ed.) Organization theory in an interorganizational perspective. Kent, OH: Kent State University, 1971; and (3) J. D. Thompson (Ed.) Approaches to organization design. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966.

18

See for example: (1) E. Dahlstrom. Exchange, influence and power. Acta Sociologica, March 1966, 9, 237-284; (2) B. A. Intriligator. Planning an inter-organizational relationship: The maryland field-based doctoral program. College Park, MD: University of Maryland, 1982; and C. B. Marrett. On the specification of inter-organizational dimensions. Sociology and Social Research, 1971, 61, 83-99.

19

See for example: (1) K. S. Cook. Exchange and power in networks of interorganizational relations. Sociological Quarterly, Winter 1977, 62-82; and (2) D. Jacobs.

1981; and (2) A. M. Huberman, N. Levinson, R. G. Havelock & P. L. Cox. Interorganizational arrangements: An approach to educational practice improvement. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 1981, 3(1), 5-22.

See for example: (1) W. M. Evan & R. C. Klemm. Interorganizational relations among hospitals: A strategy, structure and performance model. Human Relations, 1980, 33(5), 315-337; (2) J. Galaskiewicz & D. Shatin. Leadership and networks among neighborhood human service organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1981, 26, 434-448; (3) J. Galaskiewicz & S. Wasserman. A dynamic study of change in a regional corporate network. American Sociological Review, 1981, 46, 475-484; and (4) S. V. Martorana & E. Kuhns. Beyond the institution: Institutional research for interinstitutional action. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, May 1981.

See the following writings by B. A. Intriligator: (1) Inter-organizational collaboration: A strategy for faculty development and organization renewal. Journal of Teacher Education, October 1982, 33(5), 14-17; (2) New ways of planning for new realities: The collaborative option. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982; (3) Creating conditions for successful collaboration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Houston, February 1982; and (4) The educational collaborative: An exploratory study of the relationships between selected interorganizational behaviors and cooperative interaction among member school systems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Boston University, 1978.

See for example: (1) M. Allen. The structure of interorganizational elite cooperation; Interlocking corporate directorates. American Sociological Review, June 1974, 39, 393-406; (2) J. Hage & M. Aiken. Relationship of centralization to other structural properties. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 72-92; and (3) W. V. Heydebrand (Ed.) Comparative organizations: The results of empirical research. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1973.

See for example: (1) J. Pfeffer & P. Novak. Joint ventures and interorganizational interdependence. Administrative Science Quarterly, September 1976, 21, 398-418; (2) D. Robey. Designing organizations: A macro perspective. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1982; and (3) A. H. Van de Ven, G. Walker & J. Liston. Coordination patterns within an interorganizational network. Human Relations, 1979, 32(1), 19-36.

See for example: (1) L.E. Baker. Perspectives on interorganizational relationships. In D. Clark, S. McKibbin & M. Malkas (Eds), Alternative Perspectives for viewing organizations. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, January 1981; (2) D. M. Boje & D. A. Whetten. Effects of organizational strategies and contextual constraints on centrality and attribution of influence in inter-organizational networks. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1981, 26, 378-395; and (3) R. V. Hall, J.P. Clark, P.C. Giordano, P.V. Johnson & M. Van Rockel. Patterns of interorganizational relationships. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1977, 22, 457-474.

Dependence and vulnerability: An exchange approach to the control of organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, 19, 45-59; and (3) C. B. Marrett. On the specification of interorganizational dimensions. Sociology and Social Research, 1971, 61, 83-99.

20

See: R. Brailo, D. Paulson & G. Klonglan. Domain consensus: A key variable in interorganizational analysis. In M. B. Brinkerhoff & P. R. Kunz (Eds). Complex organizations and their environments. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm C. Brown Co., Publishers, 1972.

21

J. K. Benson. The interorganizational network as a political economy. Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1975, 20, 229-249.

22

A. M. Huberman, N. Levinson, R. Havelock & P. L. Cox. Interorganizational arrangements: An approach to educational practice improvement. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 1981, 3(1), p. 13.

23

L. E. Baker. Perspectives on interorganizational relationships. In D. Clark, S. McKibbin, & M. Malkas (Eds), Alternative perspectives for viewing organizations. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, January 1981.